REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending in this application, and in the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of all of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by the disclosures of one or more documents. Specifically, Claims 1-7 and 10-43 were rejected as being fully anticipated by an article "Diagnosis and Characterization Of Timing-Related Defects By Time-Dependent Light Emission" (Knebel). Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 14, 15, 28, 32, 33 and 39-41 were further rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,555,201 (Dangelo, et al.). In addition, Claims 1, 8, 9 and 39 were rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,251,159 (Rowson).

In the Office Action, the Examiner also noted that Claims 40-43 should be dependent from Claim 39, rather than Claim 36.

The rejection of the claims over Knebel is respectfully traversed. Also, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1 and 39 be amended to emphasize differences between the claims and the prior art. It is noted that the dependency of Claims 40-43 were corrected in a Preliminary Amendment, and these claims are being correctly presented herein.

For the reasons discussed below, Applicants believe that Claims 1-43, as presented herewith, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Applicants thus respectfully request that the Examiner enter this Amendment, reconsider and withdraw the above-identified rejections of Claims 1-43, and allow these claims.

The rejection of Claims 1-7 and 10-43 over Knebel is respectfully traversed because this article is not prior art as to the present application. This, in turn, is because the article discloses

the inventors' own work. Applicants are submitting herewith a Declaration, under 37 C.F.R. §1.132, that establishes this fact. This Declaration, which is signed by all of the inventors, shows that the Knebel article discloses the inventors' own work.

In the Office Action, the Examiner commented that a Declaration from all of the authors of the article was needed to show that the article is a disclosure of the inventors' own work. The present situation – where a reference is a publication of Applicant's own invention – is specifically discussed in MPEP P715.01(c). There, it is explained that a Declaration by applicant alone is sufficient to remove the publication as a reference.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 10-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by Knebel.

In rejecting Claims 1 and 39, among other claims, as being anticipated by Dangelo, et al. and Rowson, the Examiner commented in the Office Action that the terms "causal relationship information" and "optical emission" are not defined by the claims. The Examiner then commented that the claim limitation "illustrate causal relationship information" is considered to be the equivalent of "visually displaying results."

In view of these helpful comments from the Examiner, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1 and 39 be amended to better describe the "causal relationship" and the "optical emission." More specifically, Claim 1 is being amended to indicate that the "causal relationship" is the "causal relationship that one or more device activities has on one or more other device activities. Similarly, Claim 39 is being amended to indicate expressly that the "optical emission" are the "optical emissions caused by the activity that is being simulated."

Moreover, these features of Claims 1 and 39 are not shown in or suggested by the prior art.

Dangelo, for example, discloses a method and system for the hierarchical display of control and dataflow graphs that allow a user to view hierarchically filtered control and dataflow information related to a design.

Rowson describes a procedure for analyzing simulation results. This reference, though, does not teach visualization of the causal relationship information that one or more device activities has on one or more other device activities, or the optical emission caused by a simulation activity, in the contexts of Claims 1 and 39 respectively.

As discussed in detail in the present application, these features of the invention are significant because they each contribute to a design aid that is easy to use and interpret.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1 and 39 and the prior art and the advantages associated with these differences, it cannot be said that these claims are anticipated by, or rendered obvious by, the prior art. Claims 1 and 39, hence, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-38 are dependent from and are allowable with Claim 1, and Claims 40-43 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 39. The Examiner is, hence, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 14, 15, 28, 32, 33 and 39-41 as being fully anticipated by Dangelo, et al; and the rejection of Claims 1, 8, 9 and 39 as being anticipated by Rowson, and to allow Claims 1-43.

The changes requested herein to Claims 1 and 39 only expand on limitations already in the claims, and, also, are being made in response to the suggestion made by the Examiner in the Office Action to expand on these limitations. Accordingly, it is believed that entry of this

Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment. The Examiner is further requested to reconsider and to withdraw the above-discussed rejections of Claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy
Enclosure: Executed Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132